

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 10-17, 19-25, 27-47, 49, 53, 55-61, and 70 are pending. Claims 1-7, 10-17, 19-20, 23-24, 29-30, 37-38, 41-42 53, 55-58 and 60 are amended. Please cancel claims 8-9, 18, 26 and 54 without prejudice. Claim 70 is added. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments. Support for the claim amendments can be found at least on page 12, lines 13-17, page 13, lines 22-23, page 14, lines 1-3, page 16, lines 22-23, and page 17, lines 1-13 of the instant application.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-7, 10-17, 19-20, 31, 32, 38, 40-45, 47, 49, 53 and 55-61

According to the instant Office Action, claims 1-7, 10-17, 19-20, 31, 32, 38, 40-45, 47, 49, 53 and 55-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (US Patent No. 6,763,458; Watanabe hereinafter). Applicants have reviewed the Watanabe reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention set forth in claims 1-7, 10-17, 19-20, 31, 32, 38, 40-45, 47, 49, 53 and 55-61 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Watanabe.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent claims 1-7, 10-17, 19-20, 38, 53, 55-58 and 60. Claims 31 and 32 depend from claim 20 and set forth additional limitations. Claims 40-45, 47 and 49 depend from claim 38 and set forth additional limitations. Claim 59 depends from claim 58 and sets forth additional limitations. Claim 61 depends from claim 60 and sets forth additional limitations.

A shortcoming of Watanabe is that it does not teach or suggest each of the limitations of independent claims 1-7, 10-17, 19, 20 (from which claims 31 and 32 depend), 38 (from which claims 40-45, 47 and 49 depend), 53, 55-57, 58 (from which claim 59 depends) and 60 (from which claim 61 depends). Also, it is not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make a modification to Watanabe that would remedy the deficiencies of Watanabe.

In particular, Watanabe does not teach or suggest a computer system adapted to play audio files, which includes "said decompressed audio data is transferred from said system CPU to an output amplifier through a first transfer path if said computer system is operated by said first operating system, and wherein said decompressed audio data is

transferred from said system CPU to said output amplifier through a second transfer path if said computer system is operated by said second operating system” as recited in independent claims 1-2, 6-7, and 13-17. Independent claims 3-5, 10-12, 19-20, 38, 53, 55-58 and 60 recite limitations similar to those recited in independent claims 1-2, 6-7, and 13-17.

Thus, Watanabe does not teach or suggest a computer system adapted to play audio files, which includes “said decompressed audio data is transferred from said system CPU to an output amplifier through a first transfer path if said computer system is operated by said first operating system, and wherein said decompressed audio data is transferred from said system CPU to said output amplifier through a second transfer path if said computer system is operated by said mini-operating system” as recited in independent claims 3-5.

Also, Watanabe does not teach or suggest a method of playing audio files on a computer system, which includes “said decompressed audio file is transferred from said system CPU to an output amplifier through a first transfer path if said computer system is operated by said first operating system, and wherein said decompressed audio file is transferred from said system CPU to said output amplifier through a second transfer path if said computer system is operated said mini-operating system” as recited in independent claims 10, 19 and 60 (from which claim 61 depends).

Also, Watanabe does not teach or suggest a method of playing audio files on a computer system, which includes “transferring said decompressed audio data from said CPU to an output amplifier through a first transfer path if said computer system is operated by said first operating system; transferring said decompressed audio data from said CPU to said output amplifier through a second transfer path that differs from said first transfer path if said computer system is operated by said second operating system” as recited in independent claims 11-12.

Also, Watanabe does not teach or suggest a method of playing audio files on a computer system, which includes “said decompressed audio data is transferred from said system CPU to an output amplifier through a first transfer path if said system CPU runs under said first operating system, and wherein said decompressed audio data is

transferred from said system CPU to said output amplifier through a second transfer path if said audio controller runs under said second operating system” as recited in independent claims 20 (from which claims 31 and 32 depend) and 57.

Also, Watanabe does not teach or suggest a method of playing audio files on a computer system, which includes “transferring said decompressed audio data from said CPU to an output amplifier through a first transfer path if said computer system is operated by said first operating system; and transferring said decompressed audio data from said CPU to said output amplifier through a second transfer path that differs from said first transfer path if said computer system is operated by said mini-operating system” as recited in independent claims 38 (from which claims 40-45, 47 and 49 depend), 53 and 56.

Also, Watanabe does not teach or suggest a method of playing audio files on a computer system, which includes “said decompressed audio data is transferred from said system CPU to an output amplifier through a first transfer path if said computer system is operated by said first operating system, and wherein said decompressed audio data is transferred from said system CPU to said output amplifier through a second transfer path if said computer system is operated by said mini-operating system” as recited in independent claim 55.

Also, Watanabe does not teach or suggest a computer system adapted to play audio files, which includes “said decompressed audio file is transferred from said system CPU to an output amplifier through a first transfer path if said system CPU runs under said first operating system, and wherein said decompressed audio file is transferred from said system CPU to said output amplifier through a second transfer path if said audio controller runs under said mini-operating system” as recited in independent claim 58 (from which claim 59 depends).

Furthermore, it is not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design a computer system adapted to play audio files and/or a method of playing audio files to include the aforementioned limitation, as respectively presented in independent claims 1-7, 10-17, 19-20, 38, 53, 55-58 and 60.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the claimed invention set forth in claims 1-7, 10-17, 19-20, 31, 32, 38, 40-45, 47, 49, 53 and 55-61 are not taught or anticipated by Watanabe. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting claims 1-7, 10-17, 19-20, 31, 32, 38, 40-45, 47, 49, 53 and 55-61 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is traversed.

Claims 20-25, 27-28 and 34-37

According to the instant Office Action, claims 20-25, 27-28 and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Birrell et al. (US Patent No. 6,332,175; Birrell hereinafter). Applicants have reviewed the Birrell reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention set forth in claims 20-25, 27-28 and 34-37 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Birrell.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent claims 20 and 37. Claims 21-25, 27-28 and 34-36 depend from claim 20 and set forth additional limitations.

A shortcoming of Birrell is that it does not teach or suggest each of the limitations of independent claims 20 (from which claims 21-25, 27-28 and 34-36 depend) and 37. Also, it is not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make a modification to Birrell that would remedy the deficiencies of Birrell.

In particular, Birrell does not teach or suggest a computer system adapted to play audio files, which includes “said decompressed audio data is transferred from said system CPU to an output amplifier through a first transfer path if said system CPU runs under said first operating system, and wherein said decompressed audio data is transferred from said system CPU to said output amplifier through a second transfer path if said audio controller runs under said second operating system” as recited in independent claim 20 (from which from which claims 21-25, 27-28 and 34-36 depend). Independent claim 37 recites limitations similar to those recited independent claim 20. Thus, Birrell does not teach or suggest a computer system adapted to play audio files, which includes “said decompressed audio data is transferred from said system CPU to an output amplifier through a first transfer path if said system CPU runs under said first operating system, and wherein said decompressed audio data is transferred from said system CPU to said

output amplifier through a second transfer path if said audio controller runs under said second operating system” as recited in independent claim 37.

Furthermore, it is not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design a computer system adapted to play audio files, which includes “said decompressed audio data is transferred from said system CPU to an output amplifier through a first transfer path if said system CPU runs under said first operating system, and wherein said decompressed audio data is transferred from said system CPU to said output amplifier through a second transfer path if said audio controller runs under said second operating system” as recited in independent claims 20 (from which from which claims 21-25, 27-28 and 34-36 depend) and 37.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the claimed invention set forth in claims 20-25, 27-28 and 34-37 are not taught or anticipated by Birrell. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting claims 20-25, 27-28 and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is traversed.

Claims 29, 30 and 33

According to the instant Office Action, claims 29, 30 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Birrell in view of Alexander et al. (US Patent No. 6,380,968; Alexander hereinafter). Applicants have reviewed the Birrell and Alexander references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention set forth in claims 29, 30 and 33 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Birrell in view of Alexander.

A shortcoming of this combination is that the primary reference Birrell does not teach or suggest each of the limitations of independent claim 20 (from which claims 29, 30 and 33 depend), and the secondary reference Alexander fails to teach or suggest a modification to Birrell that would remedy the deficiencies of Birrell.

In particular, as presented above, the primary reference Birrell does not teach or suggest each of the limitations of claim 20. Furthermore, the secondary reference Alexander, alone or in combination with Birrell, also does not teach or suggest a computer system adapted to play audio files, which includes “said decompressed audio

data is transferred from said system CPU to an output amplifier through a first transfer path if said system CPU runs under said first operating system, and wherein said decompressed audio data is transferred from said system CPU to said output amplifier through a second transfer path if said audio controller runs under said second operating system” as recited in independent claim 20 (from which claims 29, 30 and 33 depend).

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the claimed invention set forth in claims 29, 30 and 33 are not taught or anticipated by Birrell in view of Alexander. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting claims 29, 30 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is traversed.

Claim 39

According to the instant Office Action, claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Birrell. Applicants have reviewed the Watanabe and Birrell references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention set forth in claim 39 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Watanabe in view of Birrell.

A shortcoming of this combination is that the primary reference Watanabe does not teach or suggest each of the limitations of independent claim 38 (from which claim 39 depends), and the secondary reference Birrell fails to teach or suggest a modification to Watanabe that would remedy the deficiencies of Watanabe.

In particular, as presented above, the primary reference Watanabe does not teach or suggest each of the limitations of claim 38. Furthermore, the secondary reference Birrell, alone or in combination with Watanabe, also does not teach or suggest a method of playing audio files on a computer system, which includes “transferring said decompressed audio data from said CPU to an output amplifier through a first transfer path if said computer system is operated by said first operating system; and transferring said decompressed audio data from said CPU to said output amplifier through a second transfer path that differs from said first transfer path if said computer system is operated by said mini-operating system” as recited in independent claim 38 (from which claim 39 depends).

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the claimed invention set forth in claim 39 are not taught or anticipated by Watanabe in view of Birrell. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is traversed.

Claim 46

According to the instant Office Action, claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Alexander. Applicants have reviewed the Watanabe and Alexander references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention set forth in claim 46 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Watanabe in view of Alexander.

A shortcoming of this combination is that the primary reference Watanabe does not teach or suggest each of the limitations of independent claim 38 (from which claim 46 depends), and the secondary reference Alexander fails to teach or suggest a modification to Watanabe that would remedy the deficiencies of Watanabe.

In particular, as presented above, the primary reference Watanabe does not teach or suggest each of the limitations of claim 38. Furthermore, the secondary reference Alexander, alone or in combination with Watanabe, also does not teach or suggest a method of playing audio files on a computer system, which includes “transferring said decompressed audio data from said CPU to an output amplifier through a first transfer path if said computer system is operated by said first operating system; and transferring said decompressed audio data from said CPU to said output amplifier through a second transfer path that differs from said first transfer path if said computer system is operated by said mini-operating system” as recited in independent claim 38 (from which claim 46 depends).

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the claimed invention set forth in claim 46 are not taught or anticipated by Watanabe in view of Alexander. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is traversed.

Conclusions

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application. Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160

Respectfully submitted,
MURABITO HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: March 10, 2008

/William A. Zarbis/
William A. Zarbis
Registration No.: 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

(408) 938-9060